From: **Trish Taylor/R3/USEPA/US**
Sent: 6/20/2012 10:42:46 AM

To: Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy
CC: Richard Fetzer/R3/USEPA/US@EPA; David Polish/R3/USEPA/US@EPA
Subject: Re: EPA test findings

Hello Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy

I'm sorry for the delay in response, but I wanted to get the most information possible for your series of questions regarding the Dimock Residential Groundwater Site. Listed below are your six questions, with an answer provided beneath each one.

1) Where is the sodium coming from?
EPA has not identified a point-source for the sodium detected in sampling results.

2) Has the plume of contamination been mapped?
We have not identified a plume of contamination.

3) If your cut off is 20,000 how can 40,000 and over be acceptable?
EPA has a 20,000 ug/l guideline for sodium that is currently used as a health-based guide for individuals whose dietary intake is restricted to a level of 500 mg of sodium from all dietary sources. In this scenario, an individual could drink 2 liters of water each day and consume only 40 mg of sodium from that water only a small portion of their total intake, even at a restriction of 500 mg/day. This guidance is not a regulatory standard and does not apply to the general population.

4) What is your explanation for the alarming numbers concerning the methane?
As there is no Maximum Contaminant Level (MCL) for methane, EPA selected a screening level used by the federal Office of Surface Mining (OSM) of 28 parts per million (ppm) for dissolved methane in drinking water. Twenty-eight ppm is the maximum level of methane than can be dissolved in water before the methane leaves solution and enters the air as a gas. Methane is not explosive while in solution, and OSM reports that methane in water does not impair the odor, taste or color nor does it affect in any way the potability of the water. The potential for methane in air to create an explosive environment depends on a number of factors, such as: the concentration, the volume of the space and frequency of air exchanges in the space. Proper room ventilation will ensure that methane levels in indoor air do not present a safety hazard.

EPA found levels of methane at or above the 28 ppm level in one well in the fourth set of results, and in a total of five of the 61 homes overall. Two of these wells were not connected to the residences at the time of the sample because the residents were receiving alternate water from Cabot. At a third home the resident does not use the well which is located in the basement of the home and vented to the atmosphere. At these three homes as well as two other residences where the water was being used in the home the residents have been notified by EPA of our results and the residents indicated they were already aware that their water contained levels of methane. EPA also notified Pennsylvania DEP and the Susquehanna County EMA, and can work with local officials to provide recommendations to affected residents in the event that use of well water is resumed. EPA will continue to follow this process should there be any similar instances.

5) Do you really believe the water was like this here B.C.? Before Cabot??
We believe, because long-time residents have told us, that levels of methane existed in regional water before any drilling began. As for other analytes, we do not know which may or may not have been present in previous years. Only in instances where we were provided pre-drilling well water sampling data, can we know what historic water conditions were like for that particular well.

6) Are you dumping these results on the residents and going away?
EPA's sampling conducted between January and March 2012 did not indicate levels of contaminants that would give EPA reason to take further action. To provide certainty to residents and ensure a thorough and accurate analysis, EPA resampled the four wells where previous Cabot and state data showed levels of contaminants that pose a health concern but where EPA's initial round of sampling data did not detect levels that would require action. EPA also followed up with 3 homeowners who expressed interest in initial sampling but had not been available until recently to schedule a time for the

sampling to take place. EPA is awaiting those results. Throughout EPA's work in Dimock, the Agency has used the best available scientific data to provide clarity to Dimock residents and address their concerns about the safety of their drinking water.

I hope this information is helpful. We are also putting information on-line, at www.epa.gov/aboutepa/states/pa.html, under the heading Dimock, PA Activities, and at www.epaosc.org/dimock_residential_groundwater.

Thank you,

Trish Taylor, Community Involvement Coordinator
Hazardous Site Cleanup Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 3
1650 Arch Street, Philadelphia, PA
phone: (215) 814 - 5539
fax: (215) 814 - 3015

From: **Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy**
To: Trish Taylor/R3/USEPA/US
Date: 05/08/2012 10:15 AM
Subject: EPA test findings

I am waiting to hear a response to my questions. Where is the sodium coming from? Has the plume of contamination been mapped? If your cut off is 20,000 how can 40,000 and over be acceptable? What is your explanation for the alarming numbers concerning the methane? Do you really believe the water was like this here B.C.? Before Cabot?? For us the test results open up more questions. Are you dumping these results on the residents and going away? Sincerely,
Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy